



- produced by Plaintiff to Defendant, so there is no hardship or prejudice to plaintiff in Defendant not providing copies of the exhibits to Plaintiff on September 18, 2017.
4. In fact, Plaintiff added exhibits to its list AFTER September 18, 2017 and resent its exhibits to Defendant on September 25, 2017. Plaintiff's counsel requested several photographs be added to their exhibits and Defendant did not object.
  5. Finally, there is no requirement in the Case Management Order that the actual exhibit must be marked and personal information redacted when submitted with the trial brief. Defendant has not "filed" the exhibits with the Court, so the information on the exhibits has not been produced publicly. Defendant will redact all personal identifiers from each document prior to submitting to the Court and for trial.
  6. Defendant designated each document with an exhibit letter as required, but was going to physically mark the exhibit with a letter once it was known if Plaintiff was filing any objection to a specific exhibit and if the Court was going to allow the exhibit. Many of the same exhibits have been identified by both parties. Defendant suspects that the Court does not want the same exhibit marked twice (once by plaintiff with a number and once by defendant with an alpha letter). To re-mark the exhibits physically at this time would be confusing. Defendant points out that not all of Plaintiff's exhibits are marked with numbers either. In fact, the exhibits produced by Plaintiff on September 18, 2017 were not all numbered and still contained personal identifiers throughout the records, so to file a Motion to Strike Defendant's on this basis arguing they were not compliant when Plaintiff did as well seems ironic.
  7. Defendant will ensure that all exhibits are properly marked in correct alphabetical order for trial and provided to the Court and Plaintiff before trial.

8. In sum, Plaintiff had all of the documents that Defendant TMC listed as exhibits that it would use at trial in its possession, so Defendant requests the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion to Strike and deny any challenges or objections by Plaintiff to a specific exhibit listed in Defendant's Trial Brief as being untimely and in violation of the Court's Case Management Order.

WHEREFORE, Defendant TMC Transportation, Inc. requests the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion to Strike or in the alternative require TMC Transportation, Inc. to amend its filing.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERTS PERRYMAN PC

/s/ Ted L. Perryman

Ted L. Perryman, 28410MO

Korissa M. Zickrick, 56069MO

1034 S. Brentwood Blvd., Suite 2100

St. Louis, MO 63117

(314) 421-1850/(314) 421-4346 Facsimile

*Attorneys for Defendant TMC Transportation, Inc.*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing has been sent electronically this October 5, 2017 to all counsel of record.

Maurice Graham  
GRAY RITTER AND GRAHAM  
701 Market, Suite 800  
St. Louis, MO 63101-1826  
[mgraham@grgpc.com](mailto:mgraham@grgpc.com)

John P. Heisserer  
RICE, SPATH, SUMMERS & HEISSERER  
160 S. Broadview, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 1568  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63702-1568  
[jheisserer@capelawfirm.com](mailto:jheisserer@capelawfirm.com)

/s/ Ted L. Perryman